

I feel as if the FCC is neglecting their responsibility to the American public by not taking action against Sinclair Broadcasting for airing an anti-Kerry documentary and portraying it as "news." This is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. I can imagine that if Michael Moore's anti-Bush documentary, "Fahrenheit 9/11" were to be shown on television by a major media company, the Bush administration would make every attempt to stop it, so why is this situation with Sinclair any different?

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.